G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—22 7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1901-02
~~1094~~ 191.
(Madurai)

File No. 207

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Passing orders on the petition of Avavamudu Srinivasiengar late Parichavalk in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami Temple in the Myp City appealing against the order of the Palace Controller removing him from Service.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

NOTE FOR ORDERS.

Petition of Araumdu Srinivasiengar late Paracharak of the Sri Prasannakrishna Swamy temple, Mysore, Complaining of his removal from Service.

The Palace Controller in his Rubkari No. 1013 dated 17th April 1900 reported that Araumdu Srinivasiengar was not doing his work properly that he was misusing the cooked articles before they were brought for Nivédana, that he was selling those articles, that he was maltreating the Goshti (ಗೋಷ್ಠಿ), that he was often fined and suspended.

52

is accom
he was an
dirty habits, he
d be dismissed the
The late Murrai
y thereupon
that the Pet:
d be given a
tice giving him 15
days time to produce
warasdar and that
if he failed, the Palace
controller might remove
him from Service and
appoint a competent
man instead. The
Palace Controller issued
a notice to the Pet:
in terms of the Murrai
Secretary's order. but
Pet: failed to
ce a warasdar;
Pet: was removed
m Service. Against
foregoing order,
his present petition
N.

(3)

No. 980 dated 2nd April 1902, the petr. states that he has put in upwards of 50 years of Service, that if another be appointed in his stead he can only receive the revaj (odds) of twelve annas a month with which he cannot maintain himself in his old age and that therefore he hesitated to appoint another, and therefore prays that he may be allowed to continue in Service or given a pension considering the period of his Service. This petition was ~~also~~ forwarded to the Palace Controller for report, who in reply, states in his docket

(4)

No. 75 of the 19th April 1902 that as the Petr's work was unsatisfactory and as he was dis-obedient and of dirty habits and was often punished for mis-deeds and as moreover he was unfit for further Service on account of oldage and defective eye-sight he was retired and told to produce a warasdar, which he failed to do even when he was given a written notice in the matter, and that therefore his name was struck off the barawara.

Submitted.

7.5.02

M.

(5)

Send to the Dewan.

While we may sympathize for the man in his old age, it is also necessary to see that the work is done properly. I think the order requiring him to produce a Warandar is fair. If he fails to do so, he is himself to blame. The appeal may, I think, be rejected. Yrs.

25 6. '02

RD 26 6. 02
4937 5/7.6
15. VII 02

Note continued

The above order of the Dewan was communicated to the Palace Controller and to the Petitioner.

The petitioner has again petitioned this Office, stating

18/1-/05

* Petitions Nos. 374 ~~and 393~~, dated 12th August ~~& 2nd Sept.~~ 1902.

(6)

that at the time when the Palace Controller ordered him to produce a substitute for appointment in his place, he had gone away to his native place owing to the prevalence of plague in the Mysore City, and praying that, in consideration of the long service put in by him in the Sri Prasanna-Krishnaswami temple, the Baraward which stood in his name may be transferred to that of his daughter or son-in-law.

Subd
GA
9/10/02

Subd to the Dewan

The Petr was given time to produce a Waradar, but he did not avail himself of it. He has now been finally dismissed, and another man unconnected with him has been appointed.

The case is a hard one. The rights are generally hereditary.

RDS/10/02
6440

4/10/02

If there is a Dharmadaw Warg should this case be considered. Controller

24.X.02

25/10/02

7

Note contd :—

As directed by the Dewan on page 6 of this Note, the Palace Controller who was asked to give his opinion in the matter of the dismissed Parichanak Aravamudu Sreenivasiengar's son-in-law being appointed for the Post of Parichariké in the temple, that Officer states that although the Petr. was frequently warned both in person & writing, he failed to produce his Vásasdar. The Palace Contr. thinks that nothing more can be done in the matter & that if the case is kept any longer, it will unsettle the Service in the temple.

Letter No. 65 d: 8/12/03

Submitted

18/12/03

P J O

cont'd.

A draft docket to the cour[t] enclosing the pet[n] of Arumuga Sreenivasangar that he has produced his son-in-law before the Palace cour[t] for appointment in his stead is submitted for appl

Note continued :—

The Palace cour[t] in reply to the above report[*] states that the pet[r] was given 3 opportunities in writing to produce his Vásaradár but that he failed to do so. About 15 days ago (i.e about the 26th Dec[r] 1903) the pet[r] is stated to have produced his son-in-law before the Palace cour[t] wanting him to register his (son-in-law's) name as Hakdar & to give him leave for 6 months or more to keep a Bandi. The Palace cour[t] states that as the matter had been reported to G[t], no orders were passed by him. The pet[r] is stated to have again appeared before the Palace cour[t] on the 11th Jan[y] 1904

[*] His letter No 89 of 4th Jan[y] 1904

stating that his son-in-laws father was ill of plague at Coimbatore & had left and that he appears to have repeated his request. The Palace Contr. in para 5 of his letter gives reasons to show how work suffers and states that if the substitute (petr's son-in-law) attends at once & works without asking for leave, he may be appointed on probation for 1 year. He states that certain allegations in the petn (marked blue) are false & represents "the kind of "statements with which appeal "petns are nowadays allowed "to be stuffed with impunity".

"The Palace Controller states further as follows:—
"No sooner is a disposition "shown by Govt to consider "Petrs case favorably "than he wants his nominee "to be given leave indefinitely"

Submitted to the Dewan

Ks
26/11/04

"The action taken by Govt in making Enquiries as to Petrs son-in-laws was due to the fact that Petrs had rendered long service and the appointment of Panchayat is simply to give only preliminary.

I think that the Palace Controller may be told that he may now give 3 months time to Peshwa son-in-law to come and enter upon his duties finally, that if he does so, the Barawad will be made in his name, and if he does not do so, separate final arrangements will be made for filling up the post permanently.

28/1/04

15485
28.1.04

0675 Ref. Order to be issued.

29.1.04

Draft 28/1/04

Draft-submitted.

Note continued.

The Palace Controller was written* to in terms of the above orders of the Dewan, and the petitioner was also informed that unless he produced his son-in-law before the Palace Controller within a month, and made him enter upon his duties, other arrangements would be made permanently filling up the vacancy.

* His Office Letter No. 2301 Marut 17-97, dated 8.2.04.

In reply, the Palace Controller reported that Aramadu Srinivasaiengar produced his son-in-law Krishnaiengar on the 16th Febry last, and that the latter was appointed to the former's kaiy of Adige and Sripada of the Sri Prasannakrishnaswamy temple, on pay Rs 6 12 0 per mensem, with a warning that his confirmation in his new post would depend upon his discharging his duties satisfactorily

-x No. 108, dated 3rd March '04.

d: 27 July 1904

The said Aramadu Srinivasa Iyengar then petitioned, praying that his son-in-law being a minor, he himself might be appointed as his substitute, and that the allowance of annas 12 provided in the Revised Tasdik Pathi for the permanent incumbent might be disbursed to him from the period he was relieved of his duties.

An endorsement was granted to
him stating that he might represent
his grievances to the Palace Controller.

He has again petitioned this × dy 28th Sept 1904
Office complaining that the payment
of the muras has been discontinued
on the representation of the Parpattegar
of the temple to the Palace Controller,
that the ~~latter~~ said Parpattegar
has been reporting unfavorably
to the Palace Controller against
the cooks of the temple who would
refuse to take Prasadams ~~to~~ te
at inconvenient hours of the
night to houses situated distantly
from one another. He again
reiterates his request that
he may be appointed as a substitute
for his son-in-law who has been
appointed to his post, and also given
the allowance of arua at the rate
with retrospective effect
of annas 12 as prayed for before.

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks.

Although the petitioners son-in-law named Krishnemgar was appointed by the Palace Controller to the Cookery and Sripada services on pay Rs 6-12-0 per mensem, still that young man has not yet joined the appointment. The Controller appears to have therefore appointed a third person as substitute on the full pay of the post and to be getting the work done by him.

The petitioner says in his petition that his son-in-law who is a minor, is unable to join his appointment and perform its duties, and prays therefore that he (petitioner) himself may be

appointed as ~~his~~ substitute
for his son-in-law for some time
to come.

The Palace Controller
removed the petitioner from his
appointment as he was not
doing his work satisfactorily,
as he was weak in his eyes and
as he was of dirty habits.
Govt approved of his removal,
but in consideration of his
long service and the hereditary
nature of the post, the petitioner
was given the chance of naming
his successor. Although his son-in-law
was named by him and has
been actually appointed, the
latter has not joined the post.
Petitioner says that his son-in-law
is a minor, and when interrogated
by me, he told me that the latter

is about 17 or 18 years old. If he was too young to perform the duties, the Palace Controller would not have appointed him. Matt Officer has, in some of his communications, pointed out the inconvenience of keeping open such appointments for long periods. I told the petitioner that under the circumstances, the best plan for him would be to send his son-in-law for duty, but he is very stubborn and does not consent to do so. He bitterly complains of the wrong done to him and the injustice of his removal from his post. Under these circumstances, I beg to solicit orders.

Another matter to forward,

by the petitioner is this According
to a practice obtaining in the
Prasanna Krishnaswami temple,
when any Barawarddar on
Rs 6. 12. 0 per mensem, like the
petitioner, does not himself
perform the duties, then the
working substitute is given Rs 6/-
and the Barawarddar is given
annas 12 per mensem. The petitioner
asks that this 12 annas should be
given to him from the date on
which he was relieved of his duties.
I am afraid that the whole sum
of Rs 6. 12-0 has been paid away
to the substitute till now. The
12 annas may perhaps be made
payable to the petitioner
hereafter, and the balance
of Rs 6/- paid to the working

× As ordered in the
Taalak Patte by
Rao Bahr Mr Ramaswamy Chetty

substitute.

Chancellor's Court
4/10/04

Subject to the Decree
Draught the 2nd [illegible]

116
4.10.04.

Memorandum
Expunged non-mi
Rem Rem also pen-
ded this brought
the offices as they
be stood to pen
Rem appointment
in spite of notice
given to him. The
only solution of
the question appears
to me to be the
grant of the 12th P.R.

A. Cunningham

In consideration
of his long service
and the appoint-
ment only
pending to the office
from Feb. 1st.

Memo
1.XII.04

2/12/04
Draft agreed
2/12/04

Read
12/10/04

12/10/04

Ex.
2. – Add. Subpd.
Statement 2191/14 of 04

Entered 7/12/04

With the suggestion
made by the Council
I would refer the
whole matter to
the present Palace
Officer and ask him
to settle the question
in a manner satis-
factory to all con-
cerned. In reference
from outside
applicants I
– conveniences in
such matters

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

Note cont^d.

Orders were accordingly issued in Govt Pro: No. 2219, dated 14th December 1904, referring to the Palace Officer the question of the reinstatement of the petitioner Aramudu Srinivasiengar in his office of Archaka and Sripada in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami temple in the Fort, Mysore, for his settlement in a manner satisfactory to all parties concerned. The Palace Officer was also requested to report in what manner he disposed of the question. His reply has not yet been received.

The said Aramudu Srinivasiengar again petitioned in October 1905, praying for the early disposal of the question and the petition was forwarded to the Palace Officer, in continuation of the Govt Pro: referred to above, for the submission of the report called for. He has again presented another petition, which is now under disposal.

Subd. with Draft.

25/10/08

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

RO 1589 Ex 1,
Rpo 1590 Dy 31.4.02

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 812
dated 26th Mar 02. received at the
Dewan's Office from Avavamudu
Srinivasacharya, Pancharak
in the Sri Prasanna Krishna
Swami temple at Mysore
in the matter of his appoint-
ment in the said temple.

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
~~enclosures~~, to the Palace Controller
Mysore for favour of report.

By Order,

Dfh. 31/4/02

BANGALORE,
190

by ~~Muzrai~~ Secretary
Muz Department

Encl. & Petn.



S.N.R
Pleas put
+ bind
W. 17.8.02

712

P. N. Krishna Murti Esqr. C.I.E.

Dewan of Meysore

Honoured Sir,

I, Aravamudu Shreniva Iyengar the petitioner, have been employed in the Krishnaswami of the Meysore city, as a parichara for the last 50 years and upwards. But lately was ordered to give up my employment an appoint one in my stead. If another be appointed I can only receive the reveeje of 12as per mensem, with which I don't know how can manage to maintain me in this my age. I, therefore, hesitated to appoint one Could I get one among my own people, who do that service for me. And the Govern has taken even that right away from me has appointed one in my place, and I sorry to say I am not given even that annas 12 ~~to~~ month which is due to these circumstances finding justice else, I most humbly request you to my case and either allow me to Con my service, or give me a regular pens grant, duly Considering my period

period of service. For this act of kindness and charity, I shall ever pray

I beg to remain,
Honoured Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
24/3/02

1902



From
V.N.Narasimmiyengar,Esq.,
Palace Controller,
Mysore.

To
L.Anantasamirow,Esq.,
Deputy Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore,
Muzroi Dept.,
Bangalore.

Dated 17th April 1902,

Despatched 19th April 1902

Received

General No. 75
No.

Enclosure No./

Kum. Rupees

Ls
21/4/02

He
Please submit a note

Ls
28/4/02

Adverting to his No.1589 dated 8th April 1902,has the honor to state that Aramadu Srinivasiengar was a cook in the Prasanna Krishna--svami temple, but as his work was unsatisfactory,and as he was dis--obedient and of dirty habits and was often punished for misdeeds,and as moreover he was unfit for futher service on account of old age and defective eye-sight, he was retired and told to produce a Varasdar,but he failed to do so.

2. When these circumstances were reported to Government, Rubkari No. 757 dated 23rd April 1900 was re--ceived that the man should be given a written notice to produce a Varas--dar,and if he fails to do so,he should be dismissed.

Vide no 154 dy 24/7/02

3.This he failed to do and his name was struck off the Baravard. The enclosure is herewith returned.

Palace Controller.

NS

Murzai

Read:—

Petition Regd. No. 980, dated 2nd April 1902, from Aravamudu Sreenivasiengar, late Paricharaka in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami Temple in the Mysore City, appealing against the order of the Palace Controller, Mysore, removing him from service, and praying that he may be either re-instated in his former appointment or given a pension.

And,

Docket No. 75, dated 17th April 1902; from the Palace Controller, Mysore, reporting on the above.

Order thereon

In the communication read above the Palace Controller

154 Dy 22/7/02
Misc. 17-97
155.

reports that the petitioner was not working satisfactorily in the temple, that he was disobedient and of dirty habits and was unfit for further service on account of his old age and defective eye-sight, and was therefore retired from service. The Palace Controller also adds that the petitioner was also given a written notice to produce a Varasdar for being appointed in his place This the petitioner failed to do, and he was therefore dismissed the service.

2. In these circumstances, the Govt observe that the petitioner, being a temple servant, is not entitled to

any pension, under orders conveyed in the late Chief Com^r's Pro: No. 161-3, dated 9th Apl. 1875. His re-instatement in office is ~~however~~ out of the question, as he is reported to be quite unfit for service on account of his old age and defective eye-sight. A fair opportunity was ~~also~~ given him to produce a Varasdar for being appointed in his stead; but as he failed to avail himself ~~of~~ ~~even~~ of this advantage, he is himself to blame. His appeal is accordingly rejected.

Dewan's order

20/7/92

Dy Secretary,
Mun: dep^tt.

To
The Palace Controller, Mysore.

End^t to pet^r in the terms of the above order in Kan.

ఈ క్రింది అర్హులైన విద్యార్థులనుండి దరఖాస్తులు
కోరుచున్నాము. ఎంపికైన విద్యార్థులకు 15 వ తరగతి
నుండి పోస్టుమెట్రిక్ స్థాయి వరకు ఉపకార వేతనాలు
మంజూరు చేయబడును. ఈ ఉపకార వేతనాలు ఎస్.సి.
ఎస్.టి. విద్యార్థులకు మాత్రమే వర్తిస్తాయి.
ఈ ఉపకార వేతనాలకు ఎంపికైన విద్యార్థులు
ఫీజు రీయింబర్సుమెంటు కూడా పొందగలరు.
ఈ ఉపకార వేతనాలకు ఎంపికైన విద్యార్థులు
ఇతర ఉపకార వేతనాలు పొందుటకు అర్హులు కార

MUZRAI

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Palace controller
Mysore

Dated ~~Oct. 1902~~.

Despatched 3d November 1902.

Received

General No. 864

Muzrai F. No. 17-97

Enclosure No. 1

In continuation of Govt. Pro: No. 154 Muzrai 17-97 dy 22nd Jany 1902 rejecting the appeal of Aramadu Sreenivasiengar, late Paricharak in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami temple in Mysore Fort, has the honor to forward herewith a petn. Regd. No. 374 dy 12th August 1902 received from that individua

in which it is represented that at the time when the notice was issued to him to produce a warasdar, he was absent from Mysore and praying that his son-in-law might be appointed to his place.

2. If as alleged in the petn., the petr. has eligible for the post, has the honour to enquire a son-in-law ~~who should~~ why his case should not be re-considered, ~~not his case be considered~~, ? especially seeing that he has put in a very long service in the temple ?

The Palace Comt.— is requested to report on the point ~~together with~~ & give his opinion thereon.

By order

Dewan's order) 31/10/02

Dr Rao

Mur Deputy

Exd. Dpty R.O.

MYSORE SECRETARIAT 1073.

No: 65

PALACE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE,
M Y S O R E .
DATED 8th DECEMBER 1903.

From,

V. N. Narasimmiyengar, Esq.,
Palace Controller,
M y s o r e .

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Muzroi Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to your Docket No: 864 / Muz. F.17-97 dated 3rd Nov 1902, I have the honor to state that Aravamadhu Srinivasayyangar, late Pari-charak of the Krishnasvami temple in Mysore has again failed to pro-duce his varasdar, allthough he was frequently warned both in person and writing.

2. Under these circumstances, I think that nothing more can be done in the matter, and that it will unsettle the service, if the petitioner's case is kept open any longer.

3. The petition under reply is returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
V N Narasimmiyengar
Palace Controller.

B.M.H.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
DEPUTY SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Palace Court
Mysore

Dated 2nd Jan 1904

Despatched

Received

General No. 1892

Muzrai F. No. 17-97

Enclosure No. 1

Adverting to his letter no. 65 of 8th December 1903, has the honor to forward herewith petn. presented in person on the 2nd Jan. 1904 by Aramudu Sreenivasayya representing that he has brought his son-in-law & produced him before the Palace Court as his Varasdar for appointment of Parichaka

MGCPB—1,000—21-7-03.

in the Sri Parasuma Krishna

Swami temple in Mysore Fort.

2. The Palace con[illegible]

is requested to report

if the ~~allegation~~ statement of the

pet[illegible] is true & if so,

~~what his opinion of the~~

~~Palace Court is in regard~~

whether

~~to~~ the petr's son-in-law ~~being~~

may not be

appointed Paricharaka in

the temple, as already observed in his office

Docket no 864 dated 3rd November 1902

By order

Dft- 2/1/04

Dy Secy

Mysore

Jrs

2/1/04

No. 89. ...1419 PALACE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Mysore.

Enclosures. 1

Dated 11th January 190.
12 "

From V. N. Narasimmiyengar, Esq.,
PALACE CONTROLLER,
Mysore.

Received 16/1/04
Copy could not be submitted

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Deputy Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,
M u z r o i D e p a r t m e n t,
B a n g a l o r e .

Sir,

In reply to your Docket No:1892 dated 6th Instant, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The petitioner was given 3 distinct opportunities in writing as per margin to produce his Varasdar, but failed to do so.

Notice No:1047 dated 27-4-1900.
Endorsement No:1064 dated 2-5-1900.
No:1062 dated 23-4-1905.

3. About 15 days ago, the petitioner brought his son-in-law, Krishnaiengar, and wanted me to register his name as hagdar, and to give him leave for 6 months or more, and keep a "badli" for his work. As the matter had been reported to Government in my No:65 dated 8/10th Dec1905, I passed no orders. The man is a native of Coimbatur.

4. The petitioner has again appeared before me today, and says that his son-in-law's father was ill of plague at Coimbatur and had left, and repeats his request stated in para 3.

5.

5. We have absenteeism enough and to spare in our Muzroi Institutions. No sooner is a disposition shown by Government to consider Petitioner's case favourably than he wants his nominee to be given leave indefinit - ly.I need not say that this method is the bane of our religious and charitable Institutions,and is the cause of their deterioration and de cay. If the petitioner's son-in-law will attend and work at once without asking for leave, we may appoint him on probation for 1 year.

6. The petition received with your communication aforesaid is returned. I beg to say at this opportunity that the blue-marked parts are a tissue of untruths, and represent the kind of statements with which petitions of appeal are nowadays allowed to be stuffed with impunity.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Palace Controller.

B.M.H.

(Dft as per Dewan's orders)

Mysore.

No. 2301 Dy 8.2.04.
Mar. F. 17-97.

&

" 2302. Dy 8.2.04.

To,

The Palace Contr.

Mysore

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 89 Dy 11th January 1904, reporting that Arumuga Sreenivasiengar, Pancharak in the Sri Prasanna Krishna Swamy temple, Mysore Fort, was given 3 distinct opportunities to produce his Varadar but that he failed to do so & that he subsequently brought his son-in-law & wanted his name to be registered as Hakdar & to give him leave for 6 months or so, I am directed to inform

for that the enquiries
made in the marginally
noted Comm^rs (in regard to petr's son-in-law being given the appt of Parichara) were due
to the fact that the petr
had rendered long Service
& the appt itself is of
a hereditary nature.

1. Docket no 864 dy 3rd Nov. 1902.
1. Docket no 1892 dy 6th Jan. 19

2. I am now to request
you to be so good as to
issue a notice to the petr
giving him one month's
time to produce his son-in-law
to come & enter upon his
duties finally, informing
him that if he does so,
the Nazarana will be made
in his name & that if he
does not do so, separate
final arrangements will

be made for filling up the post permanently. The result of the action taken may be intimated to this Office in due course.

I have &c

Dewan's orders

3/2

D Dey
Mursaidept

3/2/04

Encl: Copy in similar terms in Kannarese —

By order

D Dey

No. 108. 2113. PALACE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Mysore.

Enclosures.

Dated 3rd/5 March *190.*

Rec'd 7/3/04

From V. N. Narasimhaiyengar, Esq.,
THE PALACE CONTROLLER,
Mysore.

To,

Draft submitted recording the letter

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Dy. Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,
Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No: 2301 Muz.F.17-97 dated Feby.1904,

I have the honor to inform you that according to notice served on the 16th Ultimo, the petitioner A. Srinivasaiengar produced yesterday his son-in-law, one Krishnaiengar, and I have appointed him to the former's haq of adigé and Sripāda in the temple of Prasanna Krishnasvāmi at Mysore, on Rs 6-12-0.

2. I have also warned the aforesaid Krishnaiengar that his confirmation will depend on his doing his work satisfactorily.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Palace Controller.

Minute

Read:—

Correspondence ending with letter No 108 dy 3rd March 1904 from the Palace Asst Controller, Mysore stating that Anandu Seeni-Vasaiengar produced his son-in-law Krishnaiengar & that the latter has been appointed to the former's Hak of Adigê & Sreepada in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami temple at Mysore on pay Rs 6-12-0 per mensem, and that Krishnaiengar has been warned that his confirmation would depend on his doing

hi work Sales factoring.

— a —

Order thereon.

No. 3076 of 5-4-04
Mun. F. 17-97.

Recorded.

Dfl. 3.4.04

ks 31/3/04

To The Palace Court, Ilford

Mysore.

Read :—

Govt Pro: no 3016 / mmx 717-97 dy 5th April 1904 regarding the appointment of Krishnaiya son-in law of Araumdu Sreenivasiengar to the latter's hak of Adige & Archaka in the Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami temple in Mysore Fort.

And,

Petn Read/no 1209 dy 28th Sept 1904 from Araumdu Sreenivasiengar stating that his son in law who is a minor is unable to join his appointment & perform the duties & praying therefore that he himself may be appointed as substitute for his son in law for some time to come.

No. 2219 dy 14/12/04

Order thereon :— The Palace Comm

removed the Petr. from his
appointment & the Govt.
approved of his removal,
but in consideration of
his long service & the hereditary
nature of the post, he was
given the chance of naming
his Successor. Although
he named his son-in-law
who was actually appointed,
the latter has not joined the
post. The Petr. says that he himself should be restored to his appointment as his son-in-law is a minor and cannot perform the duties of the post.
complains bitterly of the
wrong done to him & of the
injustice of his removal
from his post.

2 ~~The Govt. are pleased~~ 2. Government
prefer the whole matter ~~assume~~ should rest
to the present Palace Officer petitioner Annamalai
with the request to settle ~~between~~ Ayyan's
son-in-law has also

forbidden his right

to the Office as he

finds it to join ~~the~~ it.

~~appointment in spite~~

~~of notice issued to~~

~~him~~. The whole matter

will however be reported

to the present Palace

Officer who is requested

to settle the ——

the question in a manner

satisfactory to all concerned,

and submit a report

in due course.

Dewan's order)

7/12/04

Secy

Mun: Dept

To

6/12/04

The Officer in Ch: of the

Palace Establishments,

with the Secy:

No. 2220

Endt: to the Secy:

A.O

—

No. 2220

మైసూరు ప్రభుత్వాంచరవర

కారభ్రింపే పుచ్చంలు ఇలాపేయుంచా

మైసూరు కింపర్ రండుమూంబాలగ్రహార

దల్లురుపలాంబ్ను శ్రీరణిం సీయుక్కాల్

ఇంతార్యు.

ఇప్పటిదంతు మైసూరాంసిరుపద్ధింపజిరీ

శివసన్నిధిలరుపరిపిమూం ఇలశీలోలపు గ్రీతలూ కుర్ప

ఆగచ్చిలోం పరాంగి ఇలరుపు చూంపిసి చూపుంర్తాలై

కింూంర 1904 రీలై ఇనపిశీర్ప్ంపరు ఇకరీలపురు

1209 రీలరంపరు అజీరీంరుల్లపీరాంపరిపలాయిరే

ఇప్పటిదంతు ~~మైసూరు ప్రభుత్వం~~ మూడు

~~కర్ణాటక మైసూరు~~ రాష్ట్రంలోని అరపుకీలు ఇల్లాంచుట

ఆశీర్వచనపల్లుకోర్టులు ఉపయోగించుట. ఇలక్ష అవసరం

పూంచిపంపతర్ధేచుడు.

By order,

9/12/94 Bangalore Secretary

Murgai Dispensation

Muz. 3]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. [illegible]

The accompanying Petition No. 1621

dated 6/11 : 10 : 05 received at this Office from Aramudu Srinivasa-cengar, late Sarvachark of the Sri Brahmana Krishna-swamy temple residing at Coimbatore, praying for his reinstatement in office

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~ enclosures, to the off. in charge of the Palace Estt., in contn. of Govt Prc. no 2219 dt 14:12:04, for early Subm of the report already called for on the Subject.

By Order,

30/10/05

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

BANGALORE,
1.11. 1905.

D.O. 2447

Subt to the petr.

30/10/05

2 Drafts

Muz.3]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 559-Excl

The accompanying Petition No. 246,
dated 14th July 1908, received at this
Office from Aramudu Srinivasiengar
late Cook in the Sri Parasana Krishnaswamy
temple in the Fort, Mysore, praying for his
re-instatement in office or for the grant
of a gratuity, &c.,

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
~~enclosures~~, to the Officer in charge of the
Palace Establishments, Mysore, in
continuation of Govt. Pro: no 2219 dated
4th December 1904 and this office no 2046,
dated 18th Novr. 1905, ~~forther~~ with the reqst.
that the report called for on the subject
may be submitted at a very early date.
2. The question has been
pending for a long time
and has to be decided soon.
A very early report is requested.

By Order,

Draft
25/7/08

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

BANGALORE,
31.7. 1908

25/7/08

GP —1500—20-Iu 07

Draft for approval.
Murzai

2 Draft

No. 590 C/31.7.08.

Endorsement granted to Aramudu Srinivasiengar, late Cook in the Sri Prasanna Krishna Swami temple in the Fort, Mysore, ~~praying for~~ with ref^ce to his pet^n Reg^d No. 246, dated 14^th Jul^y 1908, praying for his reinstatement in his office or the grant of gratuity thereon.

In reply, the pet^r is informed that his pet^n has been forwarded to the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments, Mysore, for report.

By order,

[illegible]
Secretary.

[illegible]